United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,722	08/28/2006	Milan Pilja	27403U 3401	
20529 NATH & ASS	7590 10/01/2007 SOCIATES		EXAMINER ESTREMSKY, GARY WAYNE ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
112 South We	st Street			
Alexandria, V	A 22314			
			3676	
		,		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•	•	•	10/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summers	10/578,722	PILJA, MILAN	PILJA, MILAN	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Gary Estremsky	3676		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence addre	ess	
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were allure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 66(a). In no event, however, may a reply fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAN	TION. The betimely filed Show the mailing date of this commoderate (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
	-· action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		s, prosecution as to the mo	erits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E				
Disposition of Claims			•	
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		the Examiner		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction			.121(d).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign all all blus Some * claim for foreign all blus some * claim foreign all blus some * clai	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	19(a)-(d) or (f).		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori		ceived in this National Sta	ge	
application from the International Bureau	•			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not rec	eived.		
Attachment(s)) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	,	(870.448)		
2) Notice of References Cited (P10-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Sum Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) ail Date		
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>hereto</u> .	5) Notice of Information Other:	mal Patent Application		

Art Unit: 3676

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

While the preamble defines the invention as "A door catch" and functionally recites the "cabinet door" as part of intended use of the invention, recitation of "wherein the wheel is supported at an outer end of the door" is ambiguous as to whether it further defines intended use of the claimed invention with unclaimed door or positively recites the invention as a specific arrangement of catch and door. Inasmuch as it is not clear whether the door is within scope of the claimed invention, the claims are rejected as not being reasonably clear.

Inasmuch as claims 5 and its dependents further define the door, particular attention should be made to Remarks, and/or amendment.

Additionally, claim 8 recitation of a "projecting from the base" seems to be missing words or has some other grammatical or punctuation error making meaning of the limitation unclear.

Art Unit: 3676

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,129,969 to Kuo.

Kuo '969 teaches Applicant's claim limitations including: a "wheel" – including 42, "radially extending portions" – the illustrated tread. It has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138. the illustrated surface on which 42 is engaged/rolls reads on "side".

As regards claim 4, the tread is disclosed to be "rubber"; which is inherently "deflectable" – *capable to be deflected*.

As regards claims 6-8, assuming the "door" is functionally recited as part of intended use, it is examiner's position that door catch of the prior art is inherently

Art Unit: 3676

capable of use in a bi-fold door arrangement and inherently capable of use with bi-fold adjacent a corner opening since it can be positioned as shown.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 3, 5, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 3,129,969 to Kuo.

Although Hkuo '969 doesn't clearly show the shape of the tread's projecting portions, the examiner takes Official Notice that tread having planar teeth portions and tread having tapered teeth are well known in the art. Since modification of the prior art catch to include same would not otherwise affect function, it would have been an obvious design choice or engineering expedient for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so in order to modify tread engagement specifics and/or manufacturing cost or aesthetic reasons.

As regards claim 9, although the angle appears to be less than 45 degrees, it would have been an obvious design choice to have it at "approximately 45 degrees" since it would not affect functionality of the prior art catch and would provide flexibility in mounting location.

Art Unit: 3676

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10 and 11 are would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- U.S. Pat. No. 1,270,060 to Scharf.
- U.S. Pat. No. 3,563,591 to Kuss.
- U.S. Pat. No. 5,966,777 to Jantschek.
- U.S. Pat. No. 6,574,837 to Jantschek.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Estremsky whose telephone number is 571 272-7055. The examiner can normally be reached on T,W,Th,F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer Gay can be reached on 571 272-7029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3676

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571,7272-1000.

Gary Estremsky
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3676